

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Official Action dated August 7, 2006, claims 1-19 were rejected. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses the Examiner's comments below. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Claim Objections

Claims 6, 7, 9, 12, 14, 17, and 18 have been objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c) as being in improper form as improper multiple dependent claims. Applicants bring the Preliminary Amendment submitted February 2, 2004 to Examiner's attention, in which multiple dependencies were removed from all claims. Thus, Applicants request that the Examiner remove the objection to claims 6, 7, 9, 12, 14, 17, and 18.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC § 101

In the 11th paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-19 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter, specifically directed towards software per se. This rejection is now traversed.

The Examiner indicates that "[t]he system disclosed in claim 1... appears to be software per se." It is unclear to Applicants how the Examiner has reached this conclusion. Claims 1-19 are *system* claims for matching input data across data records, comprising various means. The claims do not recite any elements that could be characterized as

“software per se.” Applicants submit that claims 1, 3-7, and 9-19 as pending recite statutory subject matter. Claims 2 and 8 were canceled.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC § 112, Paragraph 1

In the 9th paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-19 as allegedly lacking enablement. This rejection is now traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to remove the term “similarity indicator.” Applicants submit that claims 1, 3-7, and 9-19 now are enabled by the specification. Claims 2 and 8 were canceled.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC § 112, Paragraph 2

In the 7th paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 3-19 as allegedly not specifically pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter that the Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is now traversed.

Claims 3 and 6 have been amended and no longer include the term “vector extraction means.” Claims 4 and 5 depend on claim 3. This amendment of the claims is made so as to more clearly define the invention, and not to narrow their scope of protection with respect to the prior art, or with respect to potentially infringing devices/compositions/articles. Applicants submit that claims 3 and 6, and claims 4 and 5, which depend from claims 3 and 6, are claimed with sufficient particularity to be patentable.

Claims 7 and 9-19 do not now, nor did they prior to the present amendment, depend on claims 3 or 6, thus Applicants submit that this rejection was inappropriately applied to these claims and should be removed. Claim 8 is canceled.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(b)

In the 13th paragraphs of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-5 under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,724,597 (“Cuthbertson”). This rejection is now traversed.

Claim 1 as amended recites *“a data quality system for matching input data across record pairs of data ... comprising ... training means for...matching pairs of records...applying a set of rules... and for applying weights...for determining a set of adjusted rules and weights...and for applying the set of adjusted rules and weights.”*

The training means allows for the training of rules and weights, which are then subsequently applied by the means for applying the adjusted rules and weights. By training the rules and weights, the claimed system can determine the optimum way of matching records. These aspects of the claimed invention provide for flexibility and optimum set up of processing modules specific to the structure and format of the dataset(s) being processed.

Cuthbertson does not disclose or suggest these aspects of the claimed invention. Cuthbertson describes a method for comparing two textual strings using predefined filters, comparators, and weight factors to determine whether the two strings match (*see, e.g., 1:48-62; 4:52-57*). For example, Cutbertson states “Next, as shown by block 218, a predetermined weight factor is applied to each component of the address.” Because Cuthbertson uses predefined (or predetermined) weights and rules, Cuthbertson simply does not disclose or

suggest at least the use of *a training means... for determining a set of adjusted rules and weights* for computing an overall similarity score. Second, Cuthbertson does not disclose *means for determining, in response to user feedback...a set of adjusted rules and weights* because Cuthbertson does not use any learning technique. Third, and finally, because Cuthbertson does not determine adjusted rules and weights, it logically follows that Cuthbertson also does not disclose *applying [a] set of adjusted rules and weights* to optimize routines. Thus, claim 1 is patentably distinct over the cited reference.

Claims 3-5 variously depend from claim 1, which was shown above to be patentable over the cited reference. Claims 6-7, and 9-19 were not substantively rejected,¹ but also depend on claim 1. In addition, these claims recite additional limitations that also are not disclosed by the cited reference. Therefore, Applicants submit that dependent claims 3-5, as well as claims 6-7 and 9-19 also are patentably distinct over the cited art. Claim 2 was canceled.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3-7, and 9-19, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

¹ During a telephone call with the Examiner on December 6, 2007 with Applicants' representative Jennifer Bush, the Examiner indicated that since claims 6-19 had not been addressed substantively, they would be in the next action, which the Examiner indicated would not be final.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: December 18, 2006

By: /Jennifer R. Bush/
Attorneys for Assignee
Jennifer R. Bush, Reg. No. 50,784
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7213
Fax: (650) 938-5200